DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 511 CE 073 776

AUTHOR Neuman, Susan B.
TITLE Families Reading Together: Adult Education Students and Their Preschool Children. [Revised.]
INSTITUTION Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg. Bureau of Adult Basic and Literacy Education.
PUB DATE Jun 96
CONTRACT 98-6019
NOTE 49p.; For an earlier report, see ED 395 106.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Demonstration Programs; Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary Education; English (Second Language); *Family Literacy; *Family Programs; *Intergenerational Programs; *Literacy Education; Literature Reviews; Models; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS 353 Project; Book Clubs; Participatory Curriculum; *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

These two documents discuss two related family literacy projects that were conducted to develop a model for providing sustained literacy and developmental activities to economically disadvantaged families throughout Pennsylvania. The first document details the development/implementation of the Families Reading Together program, which built upon the findings of an existing special demonstration project and featured the following activities: adult basic education program based on a participatory approach that engaged parents in identifying issues, generating content, producing materials, and evaluating their own literacy learning; family literacy book club designed to encourage parents and children to read together and improve parents' literacy skills and confidence in their ability to educate their children; training/guided reading experiences for parents; and faculty workshops to develop teachers' understanding of literacy and teaching skills. The second document, "Children Achieving: The Influence of Access to Print Resources, Opportunity, and Parental Interaction in Storybook Reading," reports the original case-control study, in which the effect that improving families' access to literary materials has on parents' and children's language and reading skill development was explored by establishing a book club for parents (nearly all of whom were African-American or Latino) and children from six Head Start classrooms in three large metropolitan elementary schools. The second document includes 51 references and an appendix listing 12 children's literature selections. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 511

Families Reading Together: Adult Education Students and their Preschool Children

Susan B. Neuman
437 Ritter Hall
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA. 19122

Contract No.98-6019, Contract Year 1995-96

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement by these agencies should be inferred.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Keenan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE073776

Abstract

Title: "Families Reading Together: Adult Education Students and their Preschool Children Contract No.: 98-6019
Address: Susan Neuman, Ed.D., Associate Professor, CITE Department, Coordinator, Reading & Language Arts, Graduate Program;
Temple University College of Education Ritter Hall, Philadelphia, PA 191222 215-204-4982 In collaboration with the McKinley Elementary School and Family Center.
Director: Susan Neuman, Ed.D. **Funding** $27,721
Duration of Project: July 1995 to June 1996 **Number of Months:** 12

Purpose

Families Reading Together, was designed to build on an existing special demonstration family literacy program in collaboration with the McKinley Elementary School and Family Center Its purpose was to create sustained literacy and developmental benefits for families. This model was designed be disseminated to adult education providers working with economically disadvantaged parents throughout Pennsylvania To implement this program, a participatory approach to A.B.E. was developed, along with a family literacy Book Club, designed to encourage parents and children to read together and to improve parents literacy skills, interests, and confidence in their ability to serve as educators to children. Training and guided reading experiences were provided to parents, and workshops were provided to the school faculty to develop appropriate literacy understandings and teaching skills.

Summary of Findings:

Families Reading Together was highly successful in creating a participatory model of A.B.E, maintaining enrollment and progress for adults in need of reading and writing training. Such an approach, seen after two years of progress clearly showed promise for the adult literacy field. Further, analyses of book club activities reported changes in Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, used as a measure of receptive language, as well as children's Concepts of Print. Finally, the approach became institutionalized in the McKinley school, even after grant funds were no longer available. The book club continued under the auspices of a parent group in the school. These findings indicated that a relatively low cost intervention could have dramatic impact in the lives of parents and children.

Products

Several research reports were written and workbook materials were made available.

Table of Contents

Introduction	**P. 1**
The family literacy program	**P. 2**
Procedures	**P. 3**
Workshops for Staff	**P. 6**
Coordination and Dissemination	**P. 7**
Recommendations and Conclusions	**P. 7**
References	**P. 9**

Introduction

Families Reading Together was designed to break the debilitating cycle of illiteracy that passes from parents to their children by building on an existing demonstration family literacy program in collaboration with the McKinley Elementary School and Family Center. Our ultimate goal was to develop the instiutionalization of the Family Literacy program through resources available in the community.

Families Reading Together addressed the needs of young parents (70% Latino and 30% African-American) who have dropped out of high school as a consequence of economic circumstances, language difficulties and poor academic achievement. This project, therefore, was developed to enhance parents' own literacy skills as well as those of their young children. It was based on the principle of "investing in two generations at a time," (Schorr, 1987)--the belief that parents' strong desire to help their children provides motivation for participating and sustaining their efforts in learning how to read.

This project builds on research conducted in the first year of the 353 grant that showed dramatic results for literacy improvement on the part of the young parents, as well as that of their children when participating in similar types of program activities (Neuman, Celano, & Fischer, in press). This year, in addition to A.B.E. classes in English, we provided additional classes in E.S.L. Further, we extended the model to focus on parent interaction with preschoolers--a critical aspect of the project model. It enabled parents to work with and develop materials for their children, supportive of future literacy learning after the completion of the grant period. To do so we established an ongoing book club emphasizing the critical role that parents' enhanced literacy skills can serve in children's early reading preparation. (Delgado-Gaitan, 1990; Heath, 1983; Nickse & Englander, 1985).

This project, conducted from July, 1995 through June, 1996 by Dr. Susan B. Neuman, was developed with the help of several key personnel:

Dr. Donna Celano, Project Coordinator, Temple University

Ms. Lynda Panetta, McKinley School Principal

Elaine Carter, Norris Square Family Center

Leeann Ayers, Mayor's Office, Family Center

Darryl Rearson, Temple University

This model has been disseminated in several forms: through state conferences in Pennsylvania, national conferences, and through journal publications. In addition, we created video segments to augment training with parents, and auxiliary instructional materials. Further, this report can be requested through the Department of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA. 17126-0333.

The Family Literacy Program

Goals and Objectives of the Program

Our project builds on an existing A.B.E. program for parents in the McKinley Family Center, and to extend a family literacy program which included methods and opportunities for parents to engage with children in the McKinley Family center. This program was designed to increase parents' motivation to complete their A.B.E. program, as well as allow them to improve their own reading comprehension, writing, and thinking skills and apply them when working with their children.

Specifically, the following goals and objectives for this year were developed:

o Institute an A.B.E and E.S.L. program for families at the McKinley Family Center which would include classes for native as well as non-native speakers of English.

o Improve by 25% the interest and confidence of parents in their ability to read, write, and serve as educators to their own children, measured by journal entries and exit interviews.

o Improve by 25% the knowledge and specific information about approaches to family literacy and to the staff of the McKinley Family Center --teachers, health professionals, social workers, counselors, day care staff, so that they can support the work of the participants;

o Develop a workshop series where 50% of the participating parents will have an opportunity to engage in a reading/discussion series concerning language, literacy, and literature in an intergenerational setting.

o Develop an ongoing parent book club to enhance parents and children reading together.

o Enable the institutionalization of the family literacy program through ongoing connections with the family center, teacher staff, and principal at McKinley School.

Procedures

Recruitment

Parents from the McKinley Elementary School and the Norris Square Family Center were recruited to participate in the A.B.E. program through similar mechanisms as the previous year: flyers, special events (a welcoming party); and a town meeting held in the beginning of September. Since parents were familiar with the program, this year 22 initially signed up; 75% of the participants wished for E.S.L. training, while the others were interested an A.B.E. program. Further recruitment included meeting with local church personnel, placing signs in local stores, as well as meeting with local leaders in organizations including the Norris Square Civic Center, and the Mayor's Commission for Literacy, and the Family Center central office. We found that recruitment was necessary throughout the year,

though it was clear less difficult than the previous year. Classes ranged from a low of 18-35 participants during different stages of the project.

A.B.E. Program

Our ABE program was based on a participatory approach to adult basic education, one which engaged parents in curriculum development at every stage of the process. Students participated in identifying issues, generating content, producing materials, and evaluated their own literacy learning. In this respect, we hoped to engage them more integrally in the process of learning, becoming active participants in their own and their children's education. Our role, in contrast to the traditional teacher leader, was that of a "facilitator," helping student to pose problems, and link solutions to make changes in their lives. To do this, we created a structure for each lesson, which included "opening activities," helping participants with daily tasks, reading activities, writing activities, and "homework" for those who wanted to practice writing and reading in daily contexts.

As the previous year's report indicated, a progress form was preferred over formal testing to recording indicators of change. We found that the participatory approach was a particularly powerful model for newly literate adults because it connected their life concerns with literacy acquisition. A meaning-based approach allowed learners to move relatively quickly toward using and producing texts for their own purposes and in their own lives. We found that participants were often immersed in critical life struggles, struggles of adjusting to a new culture. Rather than seeing these preoccupations as obstacles to learning, our approach allowed learners to focus on themselves as part of learning. Because the acquisition of skills was contextualized, learners were less frustrated with skill limitations and more engaged with context. They could draw on their own experiences, contribute to their own learning, use literacy to accomplish their own purposes and explore issues of importance to them.

Work with our classes confirmed that when the emphasis on learning focused on meaning rather than form, students learned rapidly. Most beginning students, who knew only a few letters of the alphabet when they enrolled were able to write sentences about pictures, journal entries, language experience stories, and to read authentic texts after relatively short periods of time.

However, a participatory approach was time consuming and required great skill to implement. In addition the lack of readily available materials to use as resources intensified the challenge. These challenges demand substantial preparation time and support.

The Book Club

Our book series was designed to help parents acquire the necessary skills to conduct educational activities with their children. These sessions included reading children's literature, developing reading strategies, and then reading along with their children in the Family center. Our sessions were so successful, that the school and parents continued once the grant period ended. The sessions followed a similar format

- o Introductory activities
- o Presentation of the genre (narrative; expository; predictable text) and the children's literature book
- o Reading Aloud
- o Group discussion
- o Preparation for the reading at home
- o Reading the story along with their children

Sessions were audiotaped. These data were analyzed for the proportion of interactions that clarified, and extended information in the story, involved children's comments and questions. Our analysis indicated that certain books enhanced parents' interactions with children. Stories that were most predictable (i.e., the

Very Hungary Caterpillar) encouraged greater interaction between parent and child, particularly for those parents who were of lower proficiency in reading than others. Other stories, like "Corduroy" appeared somewhat more difficult to read; thus, fewer interactions typically occurred between parent and child. Further, we found that parents who were just learning to read could use certain highly predictable texts to effectively interact with their children. These results suggest that what parents may read to a child might influence how a reading occurs, and the benefit it may have on encouraging cognitively challenging talk for the children.

Pre- and posttest measures were conducted in the Book Club program. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, shown to be strongly predictive of reading success, was used as a measure of receptive language. In addition, the Concepts of Print, administered to the child of each parent in the program, was designed to measure gains in children's understanding of letters, book and print conventions. Both measures indicated significant differences between pre- and post test adminstrations. The results of this study are provided in an accompanying document, "Children Achieving: The Influence of Access to Print Resources, Opportunity and Parental Interaction in Storybook Reading."

Workshops for Staff

Five workshops for staff were conducted toward the end of the year regarding our program. We focused on several key issues:

o Assessment: New assessment techniques are being employed in Philadelphia along with a new report card system.

o Involvement with parents. We discussed the different ways in which parents may become involved in their children's schooling using a typology developed by Joyce Epstein in the Center for Families at Johns Hopkins University.

o Health and Nutritional Needs for Children: We invited health professionals from the community to discuss ways to help children eat and snack better.

o Homework: A special session was devoted to the homework policy in Philadelphia. Parents were encouraged to work nightly with their children on developmentally appropriate activities.

o Violence prevention: The importance of using words rather than physical means to discipline children were described.

Coordination and Dissemination

Dissemination of the family literacy project was coordinated along with the McKinley School administration. Several approaches to dissemination were used. One method of dissemination was to meet with school staff. Here, we focused on better collaboration between parents in the school and teachers. Second, we attended three national conferences to discuss the effects of our project. One of them included a keynote address to Family Literacy Programs in Ohio. Sample materials were distributed to provide examples of a "participatory approach to adult education." We developed video segments of the book club, and workshop with parents. We also created a picture album of different events throughout the year, which was prominently displayed on a bulletin board at McKinley School. Third, we wrote several chapters for Family Literacy books and special issues in journals. Finally, we presented our findings of the Family Literacy Preconvention Institute at the International Reading Association meeting in New Orleans, LA, in May 1996.

Recommendations and Conclusions

The findings of our project confirm that a participatory approach to family literacy is a powerful and promising model for addressing the needs of the growing

population of undereducated language minority adults. We believe, therefore, that the following recommendations are critical in the field of adult literacy:

- Training opportunities for participatory curriculum development need to be explanded so that it can become a more widely implemented approach in adult literacy education.
- Curriculum materials should be gathered in centralized locations to enhance teaching and learning techniques which embrace this approach.
- Collaboration and networking are powerful ways to address shared concerns and push forward the knowledge base of the field.
- A family literacy approach to adult literacy may enhance the literacy and learning practices of both parents and children.

References

Darling, S. (1989). Kenan Trust family literacy project and program model. Louisville, KY: Kenan Trust Family Literacy Project.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1990). Literacy for empowerment. New York: Falmer Press.

Edwards, P. A. & Panofsky, C.P. (1989). The effect of two training procedures on the book reading of lower-SES mothers and children. In S.M. McCormick, & J. Zutell (Eds.), Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction (pp. 35-43). Chicago, Il: National Reading Conference.

Heath, S.B. (1983). Ways with words. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Neuman, S.B, Celano, D., & Fischer, R. (in press). The children's literacy hour: A social-constructivist view of family literacy.

Neuman, S.B., & Roskos, K. (1993). Access to print for children of poverty: Differential effects of adult mediation and literacy-enriched play settings on environmental and functional print tasks. American Educational Research Journal, 30, 95-122.

Neuman, S.B. (submitted for publication). Children achieving: The influence of access to print resources, opportunity, and parental interaction in storybook reading.

Nickse, R.S. & Englander, N. (1985). At-risk parents: Collaborations for literacy, an intergenerational reading project. Equity and Choice, 1, 11-18.

Nickse, R. Speicher, A.M. & Buchek, P.C. (1988). An intergenerational adult literacy project: A family intervention/prevention model. Journal of Reading, 31, 634-642.

Children Achieving: The Influence of Access to Print Resources, Opportunity, and Parental Interaction in Storybook Reading

Susan B. Neuman

Temple University

The activity which is the subject of this report, was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

The author wishes to thank Professor David Dickinson, Lynanne Black, and Maura Moran for their assistance on this project.

Children Achieving: The Influence of Access to Print Resources, Opportunity, and Parental Interaction in Storybook Reading

Economic and social class differences in literacy-specific experiences and access to print resources have been widely documented. Based on a sociocultural perspective, this study examined an intervention strategy designed to provide access to literacy materials and opportunities for parent-child storybook reading in three Head Start Centers. There were 3 specific objectives: 1) to examine the influence of text type (highly predictable; episodic predictable, and narrative) on patterns of interaction between parents and children; 2) to examine whether there were differences in these patterns of interaction between low-proficient and proficient parent readers; and 3) to examine the impact of the intervention on children's receptive language and concepts of print compared to a control group not involved in the intervention. Seventy-one children participated in the study; forty-one parents (18 low-proficient; 23 proficient parent readers) were involved in a 12-week Book Club; 30 children served as a control group. Results indicated that text type affected patterns of interaction, and that parents' reading proficiency influenced conversational interactions, with different text types serving as a scaffold for parent-child interaction. Regardless of parental reading proficiency, however, children's receptive language and concepts of print improved significantly compared to the control group, providing further evidence for the importance of parental storybook reading on children's emerging literacy.

Children Achieving: The Influence of Access to Print Resources, Opportunity, and Parental Interaction in Storybook Reading

Might differential access to literacy-specific experiences contribute to growing and enduring disparities in reading performance? Although studies have shown that many poor families can and do provide rich literate environments (Anderson & Stokes, 1984; Neuman & Gallagher, 1994; Taylor & Dorsey-Gaines, 1988), others have argued that differences in access may have unintended and pernicious consequences for low-income children's long-term success in schooling (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1993; Maeroff, 1988). Small- as well as large-scale analyses (McCormick & Mason, 1986; Mullis, Campbell, & Farstrup, 1993) have shown substantial differences in children's reading and writing ability as a function of the economic level of their families. Such differential status, according to Lareau (1989), provides parents with unequal materials, books, and social resources, differences that may critically influence parent participation and involvement in the educational experiences of their children.

Of these resources, an accumulation of studies (Bus, Van Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995; Cochran-Smith, 1984; Dickinson & Smith, 1994; Hewison, 1988; Wells, 1985; Whitehurst, et al., 1994) suggest that access to books and shared reading experiences, in particular, appears especially important in children's early language and literacy development. As an intensely social activity, book reading provides an interactive context for children to acquire and practice developing verbal and conceptual skills. Consistent with Vygotskian (1978) and neo-Vygotskian views of development (Rogoff, 1990; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988), social guidance assists children with opportunities to participate beyond their own abilities, and to internalize activities practiced

socially, advancing their capabilities for language development, independent thinking and problem-solving. While some have recently questioned the strength of its explanatory power (Scarborough, & Dobrich, 1994), correlational and descriptive studies (Bus, et al., 1995) consistently demonstrate relationships between parent-preschooler book reading with outcome measures of language growth, emergent literacy skills, and reading achievement.

Yet as McGill-Franzen and Allington (1994) poignantly show, many low-income communities have few resources available in their homes or child-care sites. McCormick and Mason (1986), for instance, reported large differences in availability of printed materials for children between homes of low- and middle income families. Lacking access to book materials, many young children, therefore, may not be exposed to the cognitive and linguistic richness of talk that experiences with books provide. Thus, differences in access to books may influence the amount of exposure, and the opportunities for young children to engage with literary materials, laying the groundwork for future disparities among middle and low-income children.

This view contrasts sharply with a "culture of poverty perspective" (Tough, 1982) which has attributed low levels of parent involvement to lower values placed on education. Rather, an argument for access suggests that the variance lies not in the value placed on education, but on the resources and strategies available to enhance children's performance in school. Goldenberg (1987), for example, found that the low-income Hispanic parents in his study were highly motivated to help their children succeed, but were uncertain as to what they could or should do to promote reading, a topic perceived to be in the school's domain. When provided with access to resources and information, however, studies (Neuman & Gallagher, 1994; Neuman, & Roskos, 1993)

have shown that poor and minority parents' contribute significantly to their young children's language and literacy development.

Consequently, concerns for access have laid the theoretical groundwork for many intervention programs which provide parents with books, reading strategies and skills with the hope of encouraging frequent storybook reading and cognitively challenging talk with children. Handel and Goldsmith (1994), for example, developed a family reading workshop model for low proficiency adult readers, which involves lively discussions of children's books, and instruction in specific reading strategies used by good readers. Read-aloud parent clubs (Segel, 1994), highlighting enjoyment of reading children's literature, provide workshops on models of enriched storybook reading, and discussion of topics related to home literacy experiences. Other intervention approaches focus on training low-income parents in adopting new "scripts" with books, emphasizing book management, questioning techniques, language proficiency, and affect (Edwards, 1994; Valdez-Menchaca & Whitehurst, 1992; Whitehurst, et al., 1994). Though varying in scope and design, programs like these provide parents with new models, opportunity to engage with books, and resources for sharing books meaningfully with young children.

Nevertheless, some authorities have questioned whether the provision of books and encouragement to read together actually produce meaningful conversations around text (Gallimore, & Goldenberg, 1993; Purcell-Gates, 1995) In their study of home literacy in Latino households, for example, Gallimore and Goldenberg (1993) found that providing short meaningful texts (libritos) had some effect on the "scripts" parents used with their child, but did not qualitatively influence meaning-based interactions; instead, parents appeared to apply their prevailing conceptions of literacy which focused on decoding and pronouncing words onto these texts as well. Further, some have

raised doubts about efforts to impose certain literacy models on parents (Auerbach, 1989; Taylor, 1994), assuming that particular interactions typical of middle-class parents are more congruent with early literacy development. Such training models tend to ignore cultural-specific practices and the subtle process of intersubjectivity that may occur between parent and child through verbal and nonverbal interpretation. Studies (Rogoff, 1990; Tizard, & Hughes, 1984) suggest that children's understanding emerges from connecting the familiar to the novel in collaborative activity, a process essential to enhancing cognitive growth.

Thus, in contrast to an approach which assumes that parents must acquire new values, or be trained to use new scripts, this study examined the effects of an intervention strategy designed to provide access to literacy materials and discussion. It was guided by the belief that parents teach more than the mechanisms and strategies of reading during storybook activity with their children; rather, they impart sociocultural knowledge, responding to children's initiations in literate activities according to what they choose as important and what they see are the purposes of such interactions. These purposes may be shaped by the type of text being read, by parental beliefs about how best to assist their children, as well as parents' own reading proficiency, all of which will reflect different patterns and styles of social interaction. As a sociocultural activity, parents and children derive meaning from text in relation to their own lives.

Pursued from a sociocultural perspective, Ada (1988) developed an intervention that engaged Spanish-speaking parents in reading and reflecting on children's literature stories from their own personal experiences. She reasoned that parents who were reflective would be better able to teach their own children how to relate storybook reading to their experiences. Using a set

of four questions which probed these relationships, she found that parents were able to generate more meaningful discussions with children. Similarly, Delgado-Gaitan (1994) found in her intervention study that parent book discussion groups of children's literature focusing on personal experiences led to positive changes in parents self-perception and efficacy in being able to participate directly in their children's literacy learning. Encouraged to consider text in terms of their own goals, parents in each case appeared to become more interactive in reading with their children.

The present investigation builds on and extends this research. Using an intervention approach adapted from Ada (1988), the study examines conversational interactions between parents and children during story readings in a book club. Previous studies (Cochran-Smith, 1984; Snow, 1983) have indicated that frequency and quality of interactive language behaviors influence what children "take" from the book reading event. Active discussions of stories appear to enhance children's vocabulary growth, understanding and recall of stories, language production as well as their knowledge of print conventions (Dickinson & Smith, 1994; Morrow, 1988; Whitehurst, et al., 1994). Unlike previous research, however, storybook reading in this study was conceptualized as a jointly-constructed event between parent, child, and text. The role of text was explored as a variable in the interaction. Pellegrini and his colleagues (Pelligrini, Perlmutter, Galda, & Brody, 1990) for example, reported that different types of text (i.e., in their case narrative and expository) for low income children and their mothers appeared to affect the dyadic interaction around books. Here, it was reasoned that different types of text might provide greater access to participation in storybook reading among parents and children, especially for those parents who were less proficient in reading than others.

The purposes of this study were both descriptive and predictive. The investigation began by describing the linguistic features of book-reading events to determine whether there were identifiable patterns of storybook reading interactions as a function of text among parents and children in the book clubs. I then examined the extent to which joint- readings varied for proficient and less proficient parent readers. Finally, I compared the emergent literacy characteristics of growth in receptive vocabulary, and print conventions for children involved in the book club program with those who were in the control group. Consequently, through qualitative and quantitative analyses, this study sought to provide a foundation for understanding how access to literary resources may enhance children's access to literacy.

Method

Subjects and setting

Parents and children from six Head Start classrooms located in three Title 1 elementary schools in a large, urban metropolitan area participated in the project. Two of the centers served a majority of African-American children (80%; 19% Latino), and the other, largely Latino (83% Latino; 15% African-American). All families were classified as low income by Head Start standards. Eighty-five percent of the children came from single-parent homes. From the total population of 96 families, 51 (from three randomly selected classrooms; 1 per site) were asked to participate in the book club program, and 40 were assigned to a control group. Control group families were offered participation in the program at a later date.

Recruitment for the book club was conducted by teachers at each site. Notices were distributed asking parents to participate in attending a hour-long weekly club over a 12-week period designed to talk about and receive free children's books. Forty-one parents (18; 12; 11 per site; 37 mothers; 4 fathers),

out of a total of 51 families agreed to participate; 26 of these parents were African-American, 14 Latino, and one Caucasian. By self-report, 18 of these parents (12 Latino; 6 African-American) indicated that they had significant reading difficulties. Most reported having few literacy resources for children beside coloring books and a small number of children's books. None regularly read to their children.

At the end of the study, complete data were available for 71 of the 86 families originally selected: 41 in the treatment (18 nonproficient parent readers; 23 proficient) and 30 in the control group.

Procedures

Prior to the intervention, English-speaking children in treatment and control classrooms (N=81) were administered the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) (Dunn, & Dunn, 1981) as a measure of receptive language, and the Concepts of Print test (COP) (Clay, 1979) as an indicator of their knowledge of print conventions. Average scores were 20.27% (17.22) and 14.37% (S.D. 9.96) for the PPVT and COP respectively. There were no significant differences in scores between treatment and control groups (see Table 1 for descriptive statistics).

Insert Table 1 about here

Materials: Twelve illustrated storybooks were selected for the weekly book clubs. Literature selections were based on several criteria: Stories were chosen for their lively illustrations, interesting characters and topics for young children, availability in both Spanish and English, as well as the book's potential to spark interaction between parent and child. Here, it was reasoned that different types of stories might provide differing levels of scaffolding for

interaction between parents and children. For example, stories with highly predictable language, and action sequences with accompanying illustrations seemed especially conducive for active participation, particularly for parents who might be less proficient readers than others. Stories with some predictable language and refrains, but with a more episodic structure and less frequent vocabulary appeared to provide somewhat less scaffolding, whereas stories with no predictable language seemed more dependent on adult support for participation. Reflecting these distinctions, the book selections included stories with highly predictable language, and familiar sequences (i.e., Henny Penny); episodic predictable texts (i.e., Red Hen); and narratives (i.e., Snowy Day). See Appendix A for selections.

Treatment. Designed to be a meeting place for conversations about children's books and a time for parents and children to read together, book clubs were held weekly at each site, over a 12 week period. All sessions were audiotaped to ensure fidelity of treatment. Sessions followed a similar format and were co-facilitated by a parent leader and a bilingual teacher from the community. Parents were free to select either an English or Spanish version of the story.

Each week began with a choral reading of a children's book. The facilitator would dramatize the action, emphasize repetitive phrases, and sometimes stop to ask questions as she read. Following the reading, the facilitator would then engage parents in a discussion of the story, focusing on three key questions:

- What would you want your child to take away from this book? Acting as a recorder, the parent leader would list common themes, distinctive qualities about the book, descriptive phrases, and unusual vocabulary.

• What kinds of questions or comments would you use to stimulate a discussion of the story? Various question types, like recall, prediction, questions that related to other experiences, and other books would be recorded.

• How would you help your child revisit this book? Parent suggestions like rereading or activity extensions such as visiting a zoo, making cookies, or going for walks together were described.

Conversations were designed to engage parents in analyzing events and ideas presented in the story, relating stories to their own personal experiences as well as helping to bridge these experiences to their children's early educational needs. In this respect then, the discussion format assumed that parents had rich experiences to share with others that could be applied to children's literature selections.

Library pockets and small index cards were provided so that parents could write down questions they believed most useful for guiding discussions with their children. Some of the parents would then continue to discuss the book; others wanting additional practice would reread the text along with a facilitator. Following the discussion of approximately 40 minutes, parents then would visit their child's classroom and read their new book together for about 15 minutes, depending on the level of interaction. For those less proficient parent readers, they might read the story to their child, or ask him or her to pretend to read it to them; or they might tell the child the story as they remembered it using the pictures as guide. All readings were tape-recorded; copies were provided to parents at the end of the project.

Parents were given a new book each week to add to their home libraries. No specific guidelines, however, were given regarding when or how often, or in what ways to read to their child. Rather, our goal was to provide opportunities

for parents to talk about and share ways in which storybooks might enable them to spend enjoyable time with their children.

Measures. Recordings from the 4th, 8th, and 12th reading sessions in each club were used to analyze patterns of parent-child interactions. These recordings corresponded to the readings of three types of text: highly predictable (Henny Penny), predictable (Red Hen), and narrative (Snowy Day), read in counterbalanced order by parents in the three clubs. Selected among the twelve readings, procedures were similar for these sessions as all others.

Although their parents frequently volunteered in classrooms, control group children did not receive any additional reading other than what naturally occurred in the course of classroom activity or at home. All children, however, were regularly read to during circle time. Following the conclusion of the book club, children in both treatment and control groups were once again administered alternative forms of the Concepts of Print test, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

Coding

Tapes were transcribed verbatim for each of the three sessions. Conversation between the parent-child dyad was examined as an integrated unit, and not categorized separately for adult and child. Rogoff & Gauvain, (1986) have argued that meaning inherent in a jointly-constructed instructional event is obscured by dividing cooperative actions of mother and child into behaviors for which only one is said to contribute. Therefore, all utterances (parent and child), apart from the reading of the text, were coded for content.

A research assistant trained in reading and early childhood and I independently reviewed 8 randomly selected transcripts from each type of text. Each of us constructed a typology of utterances, then, together discussed, and

refined these categories. Eleven categories of interaction were identified. Once definitions and examples were described, we independently scored six additional tapes selected at random. Percentage of agreement ranged from 87%-100% (see Table 2 for a description of each coding category). After reliability was established, the remaining transcripts were coded, and percentages were calculated for each type of utterance per session, as well as the total number of utterances for the parent and child. In total, 122 transcripts were coded.

Insert Table 2 about here

In examining the findings, quantitative analyses were conducted and augmented by qualitative descriptions, illustrating excerpts from the book reading sessions.

Results

Patterns of book reading. The first analysis examined patterns of book reading for the three book types (highly predictable, episodic predictable, and narrative) to determine whether there were variations in interactions across readings. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with text condition as the within-subjects variable and the 11 types of interaction strategies as the dependent measures, revealed a significant text effect, (Wilks's lambda F (22, 214) = 3.04, $p < .001$). Follow-up univariate F-tests (2, 116 df), indicated significant differences in four utterance categories: bridging ($F = 5.39$, $p < .01$), chiming ($F = 10.85$, $p < .001$), feedback ($F = 3.06$, $p < .05$), and recalling ($F = 7.97$, $p < .001$).

Insert Table 3 about here

Means and standard deviations, shown in Table 3, indicated that differences were most distinctive between the two predictable and the narrative text. Interactions around highly predictable text involved significantly more chiming and feedback, whereas interactions around narrative text involved more bridging and recalling of text.

The following example illustrates the nature of talk that often occurred when reading the highly predictable text, Henny Penny.

Parent (reading): "Where are you going?" The sky is falling and we must go and tell the....

Child: king (chiming)

Parent: king," (feedback) said Henny Penny, Cocky Locky, and Ducky Lucky. "Oh, may I go...

Child; Too (chiming)

Parent: ...with you," (feedback) asked Goosey Lucy. "Certainly," said Henny Penny, Cocky Locky and Ducky ....

Child: Lucky (chiming)

Parent: So they went along and they went...

Child: Along (chiming)

Parent: Until they met Turky Lurky. "Where are you going..."

Child: "The sky is falling, the sky is falling.." (chiming)

In this example, the rhythm and rhyme of the text appeared to solicit the child's participation. Without specific request, the parent signaled the interaction through a kind of oral cloze technique, waiting for a response from the child (i.e, Ducky....). This was followed by an immediate feedback utterance to the response without breaking the rhythm of the text. In this respect, the reading resembled a form of responsive reading, with active participation from parent and child.

Although chiming was more frequently recorded for the episodic predictable text, clearly differences between this book type and others were not as stark as the differences between highly predictable and the narrative text. In contrast to the highly predictable text, narrative text readings of the Snowy Day involved parents and children in getting meaning and linking the text with something that either involved or went beyond the child's own experience.

The following example illustrates a very different type of interaction than the highly predictable text:

Mother (reading the Snowy Day): "After breakfast, he called to his friend from across the hall, and they went out together into the deep, deep snow. Look at the tracks (pointing to the picture) (attention vocative)--what are they (labeling)--do you make tracks? (bridging)

Child: Train tracks (bridging)

Mother: Tracks are things that can be followed (elaboration)

Child: He made lines (feedback)

Mother: Right, they could follow a track. (elaboration) What happened to the snowball Peter put in his pocket? (recall)

Child: I don't know (feedback)

Parent: Where did it go? (recall)

Child: ummmmm

Mother: It melted, right? (recall) Does Peter like to play in the snow (recall)

Child: Yes (recall)

Mother: What do you like to do? (bridging)

Child: Make a snowman (bridging)

Mother: Make a snowman or snow lady (elaboration). What else do you like to do in the snow? (bridging)

Child: I like... I like...I like to get snow all over me. (bridging)

Reading narrative text, therefore, involved greater emphasis on reconstructing certain events in the story, then moving outside of the text to take into account children's life experiences. Unlike the more collaborative reading in the highly predictable text, parent interactions took on more of a didactic role, with the child responding to questions related to the story.

These results suggest that different types of text tended to elicit different patterns of interactions between parents and children. Highly predictable text involved parents and children in more book-focused conversations, such as the chiming of familiar words and passages. These types of interactions have been described by some authorities (Dickinson & Smith, 1994; Pellegrini, Perlmutter, Galda, & Brody, 1990) as low cognitive demand talk. On the other hand, narrative text seemed to engage dyads in more cognitively challenging talk, involving efforts to understand and make connections within and beyond the text.

Differences between low proficient and proficient parent readers. The second analysis examined whether patterns and frequencies of interactions varied on the basis of parents' self-reported reading proficiency. With proficiency level as the within-subject variable and the patterns of interaction as dependent variables the MANOVA revealed a significant text effect (F (12, 105)=3.45, $p < .001$. Subsequent univariate F tests (2, 116) indicated significant differences between low- and proficient parent readers in five utterance categories: attention vocative (F=6.94, $p < .01$), bridging (F=8.94, $p < .001$), chiming (F= 3.34, $p < .05$), recalling (F= 14.11, $p <.001$), and repeating (F=4.02, $p< .05$). Means and standard deviations, reported in Table 4, showed that parents who read with difficulty more often used strategies of attention

vocative, chiming, and repeating whereas proficient readers engaged in more bridging and recalling of the story.

Insert Table 4 about here

One low-proficiency reader and his child, for example, reading Henny Penny, reflects this pattern:

Parent (reading): "Oh my, the sky is falling,... look, at that (attention vocative). What's this? (attention vocative)

Child: (silence)

Parent: The sky (labeling)

Child: The sky (repeating)

Parent: See, this says "The sky is falling."

In contrast, proficient parent readers and their children were likely to engage in talk about the story, as in this example:

Parent: Why did they think the sky was falling (recalling)

Child: Because the nut falled on her head (recalling)

Parent: OK (feedback). Why do you think they're carrying them things on their head? (bridging)

Child: Because...

Parent: They think what? Cause they think the sky is falling? (elaborating)

Child: Yes (feedback)

These data revealed that parent readers who lacked proficiency in reading and their children were more likely to engage in book-focused interactions compared to the interactions of more proficient parent readers;

these dyads focused more on meaning-based interactional strategies. Subsequent analyses indicated significant interactions between book type and reading level ($F(24, 210) = 1.78$, $p < .05$. Univariate F tests reported significant differences for the repeating strategy only ($F(2, 116) = 3.23$, $p < .05$): Parents who had difficulty in reading and their children used repeating in narrative text more than those who were proficient readers.

The analysis also revealed a significant interaction in the amount of talk among parent-child dyads of differing reading abilities.

Insert Figure 1 about here

As shown in Figure 1, low-proficiency parent readers and their children engaged in more talk using the highly predictable book, whereas proficient parent readers, the narrative text. Together, these results suggest that the type and frequency of conversational exchanges between parents and children was influenced by the book type and the parents' reading ability. For parents who lacked proficiency in reading, the highly predictable text with its repetitive language and rhyme appeared to act as a scaffold for active participation with their young children. For parents who were more at ease in reading, such a scaffold appeared unnecessary. They engaged in more conversational interactions with narrative text.

Effects of book reading on children's development. The final analysis examined differences in receptive language skills and concepts of print for children in the treatment and control groups. Analyses of covariance with pretest scores as covariates revealed significant differences for each dependent measure. Children involved in the Book Club with their parents scored significantly higher in receptive language skills ($F(2,68) = 4.40$, $p < .05$) and

concepts of print, (F 2, 68) = 7.92, $p < .01$.) than children in the control group. These results indicate that access to books and opportunity for parents and children to read together directly influenced children's emerging literacy abilities.

Insert Table 5 about here

Whether or not these differences were related to parents' reading proficiency was examined by one-way analyses of variance for each dependent measure, followed by the Tukey H.S.D. No differences between parent readers were recorded on the receptive language measure. However, differences were reported on the concepts of print: Children of parents who had difficulty in reading scored significantly higher than others. In fact, mean scores, shown in Table 5, indicated almost twice the improvement over the control group. These data indicate that given a range of resource materials that encouraged active participation, all parents, even those who lacked reading proficiency, were able to meaningfully influence their children's emergent literacy abilities through regular storybook reading. Further, it suggests more than the type of talk (i.e., low cognitive demand or high cognitive demand), it may be the frequency of conversations between parent and child that had the greatest impact on children's receptive language and knowledge of print concepts.

Changes in children's knowledge of print conventions as a result of the intervention were examined more specifically by conducting an item analysis of scores from the Concepts of Print measure. This analysis revealed that for most children, concepts learned throughout their involvement in the Book Club included: knowledge of the front of the book, the fact that print (not the picture) told the story, directional rules of left to right and the concept of word and

letter. No growth was shown in more detailed knowledge of word sequence, letter order, letter identification, and punctuation. Taken together, these data indicate that more global concepts, rather than specific print features, were learned incidentally as parent and children engaged in storybook reading.

Insert Figure 2 about here

Conclusions and Discussion

Numerous studies (Allington, 1994; Kozol, 1991; Madden, et al., 1993) have revealed the enormous inequities among economically advantaged and disadvantaged children in access to literacy-specific experiences and print resources. Large social class differences have been reported in the availability and use of print materials in day-care centers (Neuman & Roskos, 1993) as well as homes of low- and middle income children (McCormick, & Mason, 1986). Consequently, given the reported benefits of reading to young children, differential access to books and other resources may seriously impact the emerging literacy abilities of poor children living in economically disadvantaged homes and communities.

Based on a sociocultural perspective, this study examined an intervention strategy designed to provide access to literary materials and opportunities for parents and children in three Head Start centers. It argued that parents convey more than just print skills to children during storybook reading; rather, they communicate their beliefs and practices in the context of social interaction. Book clubs, therefore, were designed to engage parents in the active process of meaning construction from their own perspective and interests, and then to involve their children in highly interactive storybook

reading. However, for those parents who lacked reading proficiency themselves, it was reasoned that the issue of access might not only involve materials and opportunities, but additional supports to enhance children's interactions with print, and to make reading more comprehensible to them. Thus, our intervention examined how different types of books, ranging from highly predictable to narrative texts, might act as a scaffold for parent-child interactions.

Results of the study indicated that patterns of book reading varied according to the type of text. Reading of highly predictable stories involved a collaborative form of reading together with parents and children interactively responding to the rhymes and rhythms of text, the episodic predictable with fewer repetitive phrases somewhat less involving, while the narrative text engaged dyads in greater interaction around the meaning of the story and its connections beyond the text. Previous studies of parent-child interactions (Edwards, 1991; Ninio, 1980) have often ignored text as a critical factor in examining categories of talk in storybook reading. In contrast, this study confirms research by Pellegrini and his colleagues with Head Start families (Pellegrini, et al., 1990). Storybook reading is a jointly constructed social activity that occurs between parent, child, and text: Type of text affects parents and children's teaching and learning strategies.

Patterns of reading, however, may differ according to parents' own reading proficiency. Low-proficiency parent readers in this study tended to engage children in chiming and repeating text, providing feedback when appropriate, whereas other, more capable readers involved children in recalling and bridging behaviors. These patterns relate to previously defined categories of low-cognitive demand behaviors (i.e., chiming) and high cognitive demand behaviors (i.e., bridging). Nevertheless, even considering these differences in

behaviors, all parent readers in the Book Club--self-reported low- as well as more proficient--significantly influenced their children's receptive language and concepts of print skills. In fact, childrens' concept of print scores were almost double those of the control group.

These results, therefore, raise a number of important issues. Research by Whitehurst and his colleagues (Whitehurst, et al., 1994), as well as others have suggested that certain types of talk, like asking "what" as opposed to recitation-like questions are more highly preferred than others in advancing children's language and early literacy. In fact, numerous interventions have focused on training parents in certain interactional techniques (Edwards & Panofsky, 1989; Valdez-Menchaca & Whitehurst, 1992). Yet results from this study suggest that for young children, it may be the frequency of opportunity to engage in conversations rather than the specific type or content of the interaction. Snow and her colleagues (Snow, Baines, Chandler, Goodman, & Hemphill, 1991), for example, reported that meal-time conversations offering rich opportunities for parents and children to talk, contributed to children's oral language and ultimately their early literacy abilities.

Further, in distinguishing certain behaviors into low- and high cognitive demand, educators may ignore how different interactions contribute to children's literacy learning: chiming and repeating, for example, clearly emphasize phonemic awareness skills which are known to play a pivotal role in early reading (Adams, 1990; Stanovich, 1986). Consequently, though speculative until further replication, these findings highlight the important of oral language opportunities in storybook reading, and the contributions that different types of interactions may make toward children's early literacy. It may also argue for family literacy interventions that focus more on supporting

engagement in conversations, with the understanding that parents are already skilled in the active process of meaning construction with their children.

In spite of the many calls by educators to "regularly read stories to children," documentation of differences in reading ability in this study may indicate why many do not. Parents with a low level of literacy in our Clubs initially reported struggling with reading, and not enjoying the experience of reading together with their child. However, access to reading materials that encouraged interactivity, using highly predictable books with clear illustrations, along with the social support of their peers and facilitators, seemed to enhance parents' sense of efficacy and sheer enjoyment in fostering their children's skills and as well as that of their own. It was rare for parents not to attend sessions--in fact, subsequent Book Clubs have continued even after the leaders have gone. These results extend the findings of Ada (1988), Delgado-Gaitan (1994) and Neuman, Celano, & Fischer (in press), by demonstrating that a low-cost, social-constructed intervention can be a highly effective approach for family literacy programs.

The success of the Book Club in facilitating children's receptive language and concepts of print compared to the Control group receiving daily storybook reading in their classrooms, has a final important implication. Clearly, it once again emphasizes the significance of storybook reading in literacy development (Bus, et al., 1995; Wells, 1985). However, it also suggests the critical role that parents play in children's early literacy learning. Classroom storybook reading alone was not a substitute for parents spending time reading with their children. Classroom situations cannot provide for high levels of interactivity; storybook reading often occurs in large groups where ongoing interaction can be difficult and/or distracting. The intimacy of parents and children reading together, on the other hand, allows for ongoing conversations, clarifications of

meaning, and connections with their personal worlds. It provides further evidence for the influence of access to print resources, opportunities and parental interaction in storybook reading for children achieving in early literacy.

References

Ada, A. F. (1988). The Pajaro Valley experience. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, & J. Cummins (Ed.), Minority Education, (pp. 224-248). Clevedon, PA.: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Adams, M. (1990). Beginning to read . Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Allington, R. (1994). The schools we have. The schools we need. Reading Teacher, 48, 14-29.

Anderson, A. & Stokes, S. (1984). Social and institutional influences on the development and practice of literacy. In H. Goelman, A. Oberg, & F. Smith (Ed.), Awakening to literacy (pp. 24-37). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Auerbach, E. R. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 59, 165-181.

Bus, A., Van Ijzendoorn, M. & Pellegrini, A. (1995). Joint book reading makes for success in learning to read: A meta-analysis on intergenerational transmission of literacy. Review of Educational Research, 65, 1-21.

Clay, M. (1979). The early detection of reading difficulties . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1984). The making of a reader . Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1994). Sociocultural change through literacy: Toward the empowerment of families. In B. Ferdman, R.M. Weber, & A. Ramirez (Ed.), Literacy across languages and cultures (pp. 143-170). Albany: SUNY Press.

Dickinson, D. & Smith, M. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low-income children's vocabulary and story comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 29, 104-122.

Dunn, L. M. & Dunn, L. (1981). Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised . Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Edwards, P. (1991). Fostering early literacy through parent coaching. In E. Hiebert (Ed.), Literacy for a diverse society (pp. 199-213). New York: Teachers College Press.

Edwards, P. (1994). Responses of teachers and African-American mothers to a book-reading intervention program. In D. Dickinson (Ed.), Bridges to Literacy (pp. 175-208). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Edwards, P. A. & Panofsky, C. P. (1989). The effect of two training procedures on the book reading of lower-SES mothers and children. In S. M. McCormick, & J. Zutell (Eds.), Cognitive and social perspectives for literacy research and instruction (pp. 35-43.). Chicago, Il.: National Reading Conference.

Galdone, P. (1975). The little red hen. NY: Scholastic.

Gallimore, R. & Goldenberg, C. (1993). Activity settings of early literacy: Home and school factors in children's emergent literacy. In E. Forman, N. Minick, & C. A. Stone (Eds.), Contexts for learning (pp. 315-335). New York: Oxford University Press.

Goldenberg, C. N. (1987). 'Low-income Hispanic parents' contributions to their first-grade children's word-recognition skills. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18, 149-179.

Handel, R. & Goldsmith, E. (1994). Family reading--still got it: Adults as learners, literacy resources, and actors in the world. In D. Dickinson (Ed.), Bridges to literacy (pp. 150-174). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Hewison, J. (1988). The long-term effectiveness of parental involvement in reading: A follow-up to the Haringey reading project. 58, 184-190.

Keats, E.J. (1976). The snowy day. NY: Puffin

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities . New York: Harper Collins.

Lareau, A. (1989). Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education . New York: Falmer Press.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R., Karweit, N., Dolan, L. & Wasik, B. (1993). Success for all: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. American Educational Research Journal, 30, 123-148.

Maeroff, G. (1988). Withered hopes, stillborn dreams: The dismal panorama of urban schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 633-688.

McCormick, C. & Mason, J. (1986). Intervention procedures for increasing preschool children's interest in and knowledge about reading. In W. Teale, & E. Sulzby (Eds.), Emergent literacy (pp. 90-115). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

McGill-Franzen, A. & Allington, R. (1994). What are they to read? Education Week, (p. 51). Washington, D.C.: Editorial Projects in Education.

Morrow, L. M. (1988). Young children's responses to one-to-one readings in school settings. Reading Research Quarterly, 23, 89-107.

Mullis, I. V. S., Campbell, J. & Farstrup, A. (1993). NAEP 1992 Reading Report Card for the Nation and the States (23-ST06). U.S. Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Neuman, S. B., Celano, D., & Fischer, R. (in press). The children's literature hour: A social-constructivist approach to family literacy. Journal of Literacy Research.

Neuman, S. B. & Gallagher, P. (1994). Joining together in literacy learning: Teenage mothers and children. Reading Research Quarterly, 29, 382-401.

Neuman, S. B. & Roskos, K. (1993). Access to print for children of poverty: Differential effects of adult mediation and literacy-enriched play

settings on environmental and functional print tasks. American Educational Research Journal, 30, 95-122.

Ninio, A. (1980). Picturebook reading in mother-infant dyads belonging to two subgroups in Israel. Child Development, 51, 587-590.

Pellegrini, A. D., Perlmutter, J., Galda, L. & Brody, G. (1990). Joint reading between black Head Start children and their mothers. Child Development, 61, 443-453.

Purcell-Gates, V. (1995). Other people's words . Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context . NY: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B. & Gauvain, M. (1986). A method for the analysis of patterns, illustrated with data on mother-child instructional interaction. In J. Valsiner (Ed.), The individual subject and scientific psychology (pp. 261-290). New York: Plenum.

Scarborough, H. S. & Dobrich, W. (1994). On the efficacy of reading to preschoolers. Developmental Review, 14, 245-302.

Segel, E. (1994). "I got to get him started out right": Promoting literacy by beginning with books. In D. Dickinson (Ed.), Bridges to literacy (pp. 66-79). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Snow, C. (1983). Literacy and language: Relationships during the preschool years. Harvard Educational Review, 53, 165-189.

Snow, C., Baines, W., Chandler, J., Goodman, I. & Hemphill, L. (1991). Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, 21, 360-406.

Taylor, D. (1994). Family literacy: Resisting deficit models. TESOL Quarterly, 10, 550-552.

Taylor, D. & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988). Growing up literate: Learning from inner-city families . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R. (1988). Rousing minds to life . NY: Cambridge University Press.

Tizard, B. & Hughes, M. (1984). Young children learning . Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Tough, J. (1982). Language, poverty, and disadvantage in school. In L. Feagans, & D. C. Farran (Ed.), The language of children reared in poverty (pp. 3-18). New York: Academic.

Valdez-Menchaca, M. & Whitehurst, G. (1992). Accelerating language development through picture book reading: A systematic extension to Mexican day care. Developmental Psychology, 28, 1106-1114.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wells, G. (1985). The meaning makers . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Whitehurst, G., Arnold, D., Epstein, J., Angell, A., Smith, M. & Fischel, J. (1994). A picture book reading intervetnion in day care and home for children from low-income families. Developmental Psychology, 30, 679-689.

Zimmerman, H.W. (1989). Henny Penny. NY: Scholastic.

Appendix A

Children's Literature Selections

Brett, J> (1989) The mitten. NY: Putnam.

Brown, M. (1972). The runaway bunny. NY: Harper & Row.

Carle, E. (69). The very hungry catepiller. NY: Philomel.

Freeman, D. (1968). Corduroy. NY: Viking.

Galdone, P. (1975). .The little red hen. NY: Scholastic.

Guarino, D. (1989). Is your mama a llama. NY: Scholastic.

Keats, E.J. (1976). The snowy day. NY: Puffin.

Keats, E.J. (1971). Over in the meadow. NY: Scholastic.

Mayer, M. (1975). What do you do with a kangaroo. NY: Scholastic.

Piper, W. (1954). The little engine that could. NY: Platt & Munk.

Slobodkin, E. (1947). Caps for sale. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Zolotow, C. (1972). William's doll. NY: Harper & Row.

Table 1. **Descriptive Sample Statistics**

Category	Treatment	Control
Children's Age (in months)	50.7	51.8
Parent ethnicity		
Latino	14	13
African American	26	17
Caucasian	1	
Parents' reading proficiency		
Low-proficient	18	
Proficient	23	
Concepts of Print (COP) (possible score 24)	13.91 (SD=9.98)	14.83 (SD=9.69)
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	22.19 (SD.=17.37)	18.34 (S.D.=17.22)

Table 2. Definitions and Examples of Verbal Behavior Categories

Attention Vocative	Directing attention to picture or print ("Look! see the fox")
Bridging	Making connections from story content to everyday experiences ("Did you ever lose a mitten?")
Chiming	Reading along with the text (Parent:"Cocky Locky and Goosey" Child: "Loosey")
Clarifying	Explaining picture and/or text ("These tracks are made by a stick.")
Elaborating	Extending previous utterance with new information (Child: "A snowman." Mother: "Snow man or snow lady.")
Feedback	Correcting or confirming a response ("Yes, they're going to tell the king.")
Labeling	Labeling of objects or events ("It's snow.")
Managing	Getting the child involved ("Let's look at this together.')
Predicting	Asking for information not yet indicated in text ("What do you think will happen when Cocky Locky meets the fox?")
Recalling	Reviewing story details, plot and/or theme ("Why do you think the boy is so sad?")
Repeating	Copying previous utterance (Parent: "It's a cat. Child: A cat.")

Table 3. Mean Percentage (and Standard Deviations) of Interactions by Text Type

Category	Highly Predictable	Predictable	Narrative
Attention Vocative	5.71 (9.11)	7.20 (10.36)	4.63 (8.03)
Bridging**	4.20 (6.81)	4.88 (6.91)	11.05 (13.72)
Chiming***	22.61 (29.50)	13.39 (17.07)	1.70 (7.98)
Clarifying	2.24 (3.47)	3.68 (8.52)	4.53 (9.04)
Elaborating	7.60 (11.61)	10.63 (12.83)	9.13 (12.78)
Feeding Back*	16.22. (9.86)	10.05 (7.22)	9.90 (9.62)
Labeling	11.00 (11.97)	13.37 (17.74)	7.43 (16.49)
Managing	3.41 (6.90)	10.24 (20.11)	10.50 (23.74)
Predicting	5.54 (10.63)	5.15 (7.71)	9.33 (17.55)
Recalling***	5.24 (6.61)	5.98 (7.59)	14.10 (19.25)
Repeating	15.46 (19.25)	12.56 (14.91)	17.85 (16.07)
Total Number of Utterances	**34.51 (25.75)**	**23.76 (20.82)**	**26.70 (26.68)**

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 4. Mean Percentage (and Standard Deviations) of Interactions for Low- and Proficient Parent Readers and their Children

Category	Low-Proficient Readers	Proficient Readers
Attention Vocative**	8.34 (10.84)	3.94 (7.26)
Bridging***	3.81 (7.08)	9.87 (11.42)
Chiming*	16.58 (23.51)	9.64 (20.16)
Clarifying	2.36 (6.57)	4.33 (7.97)
Elaborating	8.40 (11.24)	10.28 (13.16)
Feeding Back	10.54 (10.29)	12.06 (7.89)
Labeling	13.49 (18.05)	9.01 (13.37)
Managing	8.16 (16.65)	7.94 (19.90)
Predicting	6.32 (10.78)	6.89 (13.99)
Recalling***	9.13 (12.78)	19.99 (18.12)
Repeating*	10.79 (17.00)	5.55 (8.47)
Total Number of Utterances		
Highly Predictable	41.72 (23.66)	28.87 (26.40)
Episodic Predictable	23.44 (11.37)	24.00 (26.24)
Narrative	17.18 (20.31)	37.22 (27.99)

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 5. **Children's Scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test and the Concepts of Print Test Before and After Intervention**

Group	Pretest		Posttest	
	Treatment	Control	Treatment	Control
PPVT*	22.19 (17.37)	18.34 (17.22)	45.11 (31.05)	30.43 (25.22)
Low-proficent	22.33(20.16)		46.22 (31.81)	
Proficient	24.17 (15.19)		45.04 (33.42)	
COP**	13.91 (9.98)	14.83 (9.69)	32.30 (20.88)	19.50 (18.21)
Low-Proficient	13.06 (14.57)		37.50 (22.18)	
Proficient	14.61 (4.31)		28.41 (20.77)	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$